UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,684	06/27/2001	Stephen Peter de Jong	MS174305.1	3970

27195	7590	08/09/2005

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
GODDARD, BRIAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
09/892,684</td><td>Applicant(s)
DE JONG ET AL.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Brian Goddard</td><td>Art Unit
2161</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _25 April 2005_.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 32-36 and 49_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 32-36 and 49_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _27 June 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 25 April 2005.

2.   Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 32-36 and 49 are pending in this application. Claims

1, 11, 32 and 49 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 25 April 2005, claim 6

was cancelled; and claims 1, 7, 11, 32 and 49 were amended. This action is made

Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 32-36 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,292,933 to Bahrs et al.

Referring to claim 1, Bahrs discloses a system that facilitates employment of a

pluggable formatter as claimed. See Figures 1-5 & 105-111 and the corresponding

portions of Bahrs' specification for this disclosure. Bahrs teaches, "a system [See Figs.

1-5 & 105-111] that facilitates employment of a pluggable formatter ['Destination' (See

Column 17, line 61 et seq.)], comprising:

a decision module [ApplicationMediator (512)] that retrieves a first data structure

['Original' object data] as a graph of objects for serialization thereof [See

PlacementListener (514)];

a plurality of rule sets [ValidationRules (504) & 'Base Serializer Class'] that define

serialization information about data structure types;

a serialization selector ['Serializer' (See Figs. 105-111] that determines a rule set

of the plurality of rule sets to provide to the decision module based on the data structure

type, the decision module populating a second data structure ['Changed' object data]

based on the serialization information and providing a pluggable formatter ['Destination'

(See Column 17, line 61 et seq.)] with the second data structure, so that the pluggable

formatter can serialize the second data structure to an externalized [remote] format

defined by the pluggable formatter" as claimed.

Referring to claims 2-4, Bahrs teaches the system of claim 1, as above, wherein

the rule set is defined in the data structure, a third party file or as a default format [See

ValidationRules (504) & Figs. 105-111] as claimed.

Referring to claim 5, Bahrs teaches the system of claim 1, as above, wherein the

first data structure is an object [See Fig. 5] as claimed.

Referring to claim 7, Bahrs teaches the system of claim 6, as above, further

comprising an object ID generator [PlacementListener (514)] coupled to the decision

module, the object ID generator assigns object IDs to each object in the graph of

objects as claimed.

Referring to claim 8, Bahrs teaches the system of claim 1, as above, the data

structure containing information [data element code(s)] within the data structure that the

serialization selector utilizes in determining a rule set [See Column 59, line 10 et seq.]

as claimed.

Referring to claim 9, Bahrs teaches the system of claim 1, as above, wherein the decision module is integrated into the pluggable formatter [See Column 17, line 61 et seq.] as claimed.

Referring to claim 11, Bahrs teaches a system that facilitates employment of a pluggable formatter [See Figs. 1-5 & 105-111 and Discussions of claims 1-9 above], comprising:

a formatter services component [Transporter (524)] that receives a decoded serialized stream from a pluggable formatter and creates a data structure [Base Deserializer Class] as a graph of objects [See above] for deserialization of the decoded serialized stream; and

an object manager [ApplicationMediator (512)] that tracks data in the decoded serialized stream [RequestEvent (522)] and determines forward references to additional data to provide fixups to the data structure upon receipt of the additional data [See Figs. 5 & 106] as claimed.

Claim 12 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1, in light of the basis for claim 11. See the discussions regarding claims 1 and 11 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 13-14 are rejected on the same basis as claims 2-3 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 12. See the discussions regarding claims 1-3 and 11-12 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 16 is rejected on the same basis as claim 6, in light of the basis for claim

11. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 6 and 11 above for the details of this

disclosure.

Claims 32-36 are rejected on substantially the same basis as claims 1-9, 11-14

and 16. See the discussions regarding claims 1-9, 11-14 and 16 above, as well as the

portions of Bahrs' specification cited therein, for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 49 is rejected on substantially the same basis as claims 1 and 11. See the

discussions regarding claims 1 and 11 above, as well as the portions of Bahrs'

specification cited therein, for the details of this disclosure.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicants' arguments filed 25 April 2005 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Referring to applicants' remarks on pages 7-8 regarding the Section 102

rejection of amended claim 1 (incorporating the subject matter of cancelled claim 6):

Applicants argued that Bahrs does not disclose or suggest a graph of objects as

claimed.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons: Applicants' have loosely

defined "a graph of objects" as "a data structure that groups one or more objects

together" on page 7 of the remarks. Bahrs' graphical objects (or GUI elements)

represented by ViewControllers (502) are objects as claimed. As disclosed in Bahrs

Column 16, line 18 et seq. and admitted by applicants, Bahrs PlacementListener (514)

manages the placement/containment of ViewControllers (objects) on the screen of a computer. Furthermore, Bahrs PlacementListener (514) is a data structure [e.g. See Fig. 19]. Thus, Bahrs PlacementListener (514) is "a data structure that groups one or more objects together" – a graph of objects. In other words, the overall display is composed of many graphical objects, which are placed/contained in a certain manner by the PlacementListener. Whether serializing or deserializing, Bahrs system MUST maintain the ordered grouping of the individual graphical objects – a "graph of objects" as claimed. Therefore, Bahrs does disclose the claimed "graph of objects" contrary to applicants' assertions.

Conclusion

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Goddard whose telephone number is 571-272-4020. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bdg
04 August 2005

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100